

REMARKS

Claim 9 has been amended to call for transforming said data elements for a visual display. This overcomes the examiner's objection that there is no transforming step in the claims as currently pending.

Likewise, claim 14 was amended commensurately.

Claim 21 has been amended to take out the information which made it unclear whether than the claim covered a method or software and to adopt the language suggested in the office action. Therefore claim 21 and similarly-amended claim 26 should be in condition for allowance.


The basis for the objection under § 101 to the apparatus of claim 30 is not set forth in the office action. It is not believed that there could be any valid § 101 to an apparatus claim. Therefore, reconsideration is requested.

The suggestion that claim 35 is objectionable on the same basis as claims 21 and 26 is not understood, since claim 35 is directed to apparatus. There is no basis for suggesting that there is no transformation here, because software is not being claimed, but instead the apparatus which does the operation is claimed. Therefore, reconsideration would seem to be appropriate.

In view of these remarks, the application should now be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 12, 2007



Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750
Houston, TX 77057-2631
713/468-8880 [Phone]
713/468-8883 [Fax]